

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Applicants are submitting herewith a replacement set of drawings in order to replace Figs. 1-26 as originally filed with Figs. 1-13 submitted herewith. Applicants respectfully submit that the replacement drawings submitted herewith are fully supported by the specification and, therefore, do not introduce any new matter.

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 27-38 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-26 are canceled by this amendment. Claims 27-38 are added as new claims. No new matter has been added.

Applicants note that minor grammatical changes have been made to the Abstract and to page 4 of the specification. No new matter has been added by these changes.

I. Objection to the drawings, objection to the specification, and rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Examiner has objected to the drawings, objected to the specification, and rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for the reasons set forth on pages 2-3 of the Office Action. In particular, the Examiner notes that the drawings do not match the description of the drawings in the specification, and that the specification does not include a description of each of the drawings.

Applicants are submitting herewith a replacement set of drawings in order to replace Figs. 1-26 as originally filed with Figs. 1-13 submitted herewith. Applicants respectfully submit that the replacement drawings submitted herewith are fully supported by the specification and, therefore, do not introduce any new matter.

Applicants note that support for each of Figs. 1-13 submitted herewith can be found in the specification as originally filed as follows:

Regarding Fig. 1, Applicants note that this drawing is supported by the description in the specification at page 15, line 7 through page 16, line 3;

Regarding Fig. 2, Applicants note that this drawing is supported by the description in the specification at page 16, line 20 through page 22, line 1;

Regarding Fig. 3, Applicants note that this drawing is supported by the description in the specification at page 22, line 2 through page 25, line 10;

Regarding Fig. 4, Applicants note that this drawing is supported by the description in the specification at page 25, line 14 through page 29, line 15;

Regarding Fig. 5, Applicants note that this drawing is supported by the description in the specification at page 29, line 16 through page 30, line 8;

Regarding Fig. 6, Applicants note that this drawing is supported by the description in the specification at page 30, line 10 through page 31, line 19;

Regarding Fig. 7, Applicants note that this drawing is supported by the description in the specification at page 31, line 20 through page 33, line 13;

Regarding Fig. 8, Applicants note that this drawing is supported by the description in the specification at page 33, line 21 through page 35, line 12;

Regarding Fig. 9, Applicants note that this drawing is supported by the description in the specification at page 35, line 21 through page 37, line 12;

Regarding Fig. 10, Applicants note that this drawing is supported by the description in the specification at page 37, line 21 through page 38, line 15;

Regarding Fig. 11, Applicants note that this drawing is supported by the description in the specification at page 38, line 16 through page 40, line 8;

Regarding Fig. 12, Applicants note that this drawing is supported by the description in the specification at page 40, line 10 through page 41, line 20; and

Regarding Fig. 13, Applicants note that this drawing is supported by the description in the original specification at page 41, line 22 through page 45, line 10.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants kindly request that the Examiner reconsider and

withdraw the above-noted objection to the drawings, the objection to the specification, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

II. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 4, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite; claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 12-15, 17-20 and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kikuchi et al. (U.S. 6,577,811); and claims 1, 2, 6-8, 11-13, 15-18, 20-23, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Isobe et al (U.S. 2002/0018644).

To facilitate the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and to more clearly define the novel features of the present invention, original claims 1-26 have been canceled and have been replaced with new claims 27-38. Applicants note that each of these claims has been drafted to ensure compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph (e.g., Applicants note that the phrase "last, incomplete" is not included in the newly added claims).

In addition, Applicants submit that each of the newly submitted claims is distinguishable over the prior art references applied by the Examiner for at least the following reasons.

A. Kikuchi et al. (U.S. 6,577,811)

Claim 27 recites the feature of a coordination unit operable to, if the detecting unit detects the abnormality, perform a coordination process for the playback control information that was generated on a presumption that the video data has been recorded completely onto the recording medium, wherein, in the coordination process, the coordination unit makes a judgment on how the predetermined section of the video data in the playback control information generated by the

generating unit coordinates with a recording complete section of the video data that was recorded by the recording unit, excluding a recording incomplete section of the video data, and corrects the generated playback control information in accordance with the recording complete section of the video data. Applicants respectfully submit that Kikuchi does not disclose or suggest at least these features recited in new claim 27.

Regarding Kikuchi, Applicants note that this reference discloses the ability to manage data through the use of erase prohibition flags that can be set in cell playback information (see col. 73, lines 45-47 and Fig. 23). In Kikuchi, it is disclosed that the erase prohibition flags can be set in units of cells, and therefore, that data can be managed precisely (see col. 73, lines 48-50).

As explained in Kikuchi, when an erase prohibition range is not set in units of cells of the current cell, the current cell is divided by a cell separator to set a sequence of advanced cells (see Abstract). After setting the sequence of advanced cells, management information is reconstructed for playing back the advanced cells and the current cell, and erase prohibition information is appended to the management information for playing back the advanced cells that belong to the range (see Abstract).

In view of the foregoing description of Kikuchi, Applicants respectfully submit that while Kikuchi discloses the ability to set an erase prohibition range and to append erase prohibition information to management information, that Kikuchi does not in any way disclose or suggest the ability to perform a coordination process when an abnormality is detected such as the recording of video data being incomplete.

In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Kikuchi does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature of a coordination unit operable to, if the

detecting unit detects the abnormality, perform a coordination process for the playback control information that was generated on a presumption that the video data has been recorded completely onto the recording medium, wherein, in the coordination process, the coordination unit makes a judgment on how the predetermined section of the video data in the playback control information generated by the generating unit coordinates with a recording complete section of the video data that was recorded by the recording unit, excluding a recording incomplete section of the video data, and corrects the generated playback control information in accordance with the recording complete section of the video data, as recited in new claim 27.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 27 is patentable over Kikuchi, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 28-32 depend from claim 27 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 33, Applicants note that this claim recites the feature of a coordination unit operable to, if the detecting unit detects the abnormality, perform a coordination process for the playback control information that was generated on a presumption that the video data has been recorded completely onto the recording medium, wherein, in the coordination process, the coordination unit restores the playback control information generated by the generating unit from the saving information, makes a judgment on how the predetermined section of the video data in the restored playback control information coordinates with a recording complete section of the video data that was recorded by the recording unit, excluding a recording incomplete section of the video data, and corrects the generated playback control information in accordance with the recording complete section of the video data.

As noted above, while Kikuchi discloses the ability to set an erase prohibition range and to append erase prohibition information to management information, Applicants respectfully

submit that Kikuchi does not in any way disclose or suggest the ability to perform a coordination process when an abnormality is detected such as the recording of video data being incomplete.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Kikuchi does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the feature of a coordination unit operable to, if the detecting unit detects the abnormality, perform a coordination process for the playback control information that was generated on a presumption that the video data has been recorded completely onto the recording medium, wherein, in the coordination process, the coordination unit restores the playback control information generated by the generating unit from the saving information, makes a judgment on how the predetermined section of the video data in the restored playback control information coordinates with a recording complete section of the video data that was recorded by the recording unit, excluding a recording incomplete section of the video data, and corrects the generated playback control information in accordance with the recording complete section of the video data, as recited in new claim 33.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 33 is patentable over Kikuchi, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claims 34 and 36, Applicants note that each of these claims recites the feature of performing, if the abnormality is detected, a coordination process for the playback control information that was generated on a presumption that the video data has been recorded completely onto the recording medium, wherein, in the coordination process, a judgment is made on how the predetermined section of the video data in the playback control information generated by the generating unit coordinates with a recording complete section of the video data that was recorded, excluding a recording incomplete section of the video data, and the generated playback control information is corrected in accordance with the recording complete section of

the video data.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above regarding claim 27, Applicants respectfully submit that Kikuchi does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in claims 34 and 36. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 34 and 36 are patentable over Kikuchi, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claims 35, 37 and 38, Applicants note that each of these claims recites the feature of performing, if the abnormality is detected, a coordination process for the playback control information that was generated on a presumption that the video data has been recorded completely onto the recording medium, wherein, in the coordination process, the generated playback control information is restored from the saving information, a judgment is made on how the predetermined section of the video data in the restored playback control information coordinates with a recording complete section of the video data that was recorded, excluding a recording incomplete section of the video data, and the generated playback control information is corrected in accordance with the recording complete section of the video data.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above regarding claim 33, Applicants respectfully submit that Kikuchi does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in claims 35, 37 and 38. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 35, 37 and 38 are patentable over Kikuchi, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Isobe et al. (U.S. 2002/0018644)

Regarding the Isobe et al. reference, Applicants submit that this reference is not prior art against the claims of the present application because the Isobe et al. reference has a filing date of May 8, 2001, which is subsequent to the present application's priority date of June 26, 2000.

Applicants are submitting herewith verified English translations of the priority documents (JP 2000-190890 and JP 2000-190891).

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Tokuo NAKATANI et al.

By: Kenneth W. Fields
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/dib
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 3, 2006